



Lower Mystic Regional Working Group

**June 13, 2016
Mass DOT Offices, 10 Park Plaza
9:00 AM – 11:00 AM
Draft Meeting Summary**

Action Items from the meeting

- By 7/31, send policy or infrastructure ideas under consideration to be modeled by MAPC and CTPS. Please send any policy or infrastructure ideas to Mark Abbott (CTPS), Pat Field (CBI), and Elizabeth Cooper (CBI): mabbott@ctps.org; pfield@cbuilding.org; ecooper@cbuilding.org.
- By 7/1, send in any adjustments to the considerations for the *no-build scenario*.
- CBI will plan a public engagement strategy meeting
- CTPS will finalize the intersection map (and include symbols to denote intersections that Wynn also studied) and list.
- Mark Draisen, Tim Reardon (MAPC), and David Mohler (OTP) will reach out to surrounding communities to apprise them of the plans coming out of this group. Officials from Medford, Malden, Chelsea, Revere, and Cambridge will be kept in the loop through upcoming MAPC meetings.
- CBI will change the May meeting summary to reflect MGC's comment from the 6/13/16 meeting.

Notes from the meeting

Meeting objectives:

- Finalize products from last meeting (meeting summary, intersections, study area)
- Detail and refine list of possible policies, projects, and pricing to serve as the “menu” of components and options to combine into alternatives
- Review the work plan for upcoming meetings

Key discussions:

May meeting minutes:

One participant suggested that the May minutes include mention that Wynn Boston Harbor stated a preference for the entire working group to be able to have an official say in the process decisions, removing the distinction between members deciding and participants providing input. With this edit, the group accepted the minutes of the May meeting.

Finalizing revised study area:

The group noted that Boston and Somerville provided an additional round of feedback to CTPS, resulting in the addition of five intersections in Boston and one in Somerville. The

group also agreed to remove intersections #4 and #50 from the study, bringing the total number of locations to 56 and total number of intersections to 74. The group agreed to note that some of the prior intersection studies were completed by Wynn Boston Harbor. The group then agreed to finalize the study area with these changes. CTPS noted that while these locations and intersections will be the basis for all future analysis, July's presentation on existing conditions may not include the detail of the six intersections recently added, because of the time needed to incorporate the data from those intersections.

Policy and TDM Options:

Mr. Field introduced the topic noting that this discussion of options would be a precursor to the upcoming task over the following several meetings to package options and consider alternatives.

Mr. Abbott explained to the group that CTPS and MAPC are developing a list of options to model for the group. He said that it would be important for the municipalities to weigh in on the proposed options and suggest additions since they wanted to be sure that the modeled options are ones that the municipalities might actually pursue.

Mr. Abbott also offered an explanation of Cambridge's parking and transportation ordinance as an example of potential strategies to manage traffic and development. Cambridge reduced single occupant vehicle (SOV) mode share to about 45% from over 50%. He described several of the measures as part of Cambridge's efforts to reduce SOV use and congestion.

Mr. Abbott explained that not all of these policies or incentives can be modeled, but some—especially those that are localized rather than regional—can. Those that are more regional, such as the impact of subsidized T passes, can be looked at in other ways. The group discussed the distinction between commercial parking spaces versus employer-provided parking spaces and emphasized the efficiency gained from commercially available spaces. Mr. Reardon also mentioned that car use changes can be modeled by levers at both the generation and destination sides of trips; i.e., not just by availability of destination parking, but also by land use development decisions for existing and new households.

Mr. Abbott then presented an initial list of CTPS-generated policy and TDM components for modeling. Mr. Abbott and Mr. Reardon emphasized that they welcomed new ideas from the group to include in either the TDM or Land Use Model. The group decided the deadline for submitting ideas to be considered in the model would be July 31, 2016.

The group discussed the need to balance political feasibility of options to consider (to make sure that the effort of modeling an option was worthwhile as a real alternative) on one hand and the need to leave space for more ambitious proposals and potential political evolution over a 30- to 40-year timeframe.

Infrastructure Components:

Mr. Abbott presented an initial list of potential infrastructure components based on the group's feedback to CBI during its assessment. He asked the group members to share any

other ideas that they had, even if they were not definitive projects. He noted that the list was currently lighter on bike and pedestrian options. The group discussed the need to keep in mind the costs for new infrastructure purchases when suggesting options. Ballpark estimates are helpful to compare options at this early phase. The group noted, however, that more specific cost estimates (as well as revenue sources) would be developed further along in the process of developing scenarios.

The group commented on the need to clarify whether options belonged in the modeling category or in the no-build if they were already reasonably likely to take place or already planned. The group also offered potential options to Mr. Abbott during the meeting:

POLICY suggestions and/or additions:

- Some of the current policies proposed in the list by CTPS should actually be considered projects, including:
 - 3 – Expansion of MBTA service (more cars, trips, etc.)
 - 6 – Increased MBTA service, frequency
 - 8 – Consolidate bus service for better overall, efficient service
 - 9 – Not just more transit but a higher quality experience on transit (i.e., increase frequency, reduce wait times, express service, etc.)
- Two-way tolling on Tobin Bridge (#1) is already in motion, so that should be considered in the no-build scenario
- Incorporate telecommuting and short-week employer policies in #12 – flexible work schedules
- Include expanded or new Park and Ride as a component
- Model T-pass subsidies or actual full employer purchasing
- Consider policy/regulation changes between employee and commercial parking restrictions/requirements due to CIPs
- Explain better the regional non-MBTA shuttle and how that is different than employee-sponsored services like MASCO
- Consolidate some of the proposed policy options to ensure they are not duplicative

INFRASTRUCTURE suggestions and/or additions:

- Consider option of a transfer between Sullivan Square T and the commuter rail in addition to or as part of the Casino option
- Proposal #4 – Alternate access to Rutherford Avenue along Spice and “D” Street – Charlestown – should be relabeled “D Street Relocation” since part of this project is already in (or should be in) the no build
- Add a southbound I-93 route as part of or separate than the north bound ramp option at City Square
- GLX1 should go in the no-build scenario and GLX2 added to the alternative scenarios
- Clarify what parts of Rutherford Avenue go into the no-build versus other alternatives
- Identify any changes made since the last LRTP as that is the basis for the no-build scenario
- Model a potential no or incomplete GLX1 scenario in case the project falls through

- Include the North Point multi-modal bridge idea
- Include the Leverett Circle redesign

BICYCLE/PEDESTRIAN suggestions and/or additions:

- Add in the bike/pedestrian path upgrades near Sullivan under consideration by MBTA
- Add in the potential multiple use path along McGrath Highway

Public Engagement:

Mr. Field noted that the group planned to pursue a broader engagement strategy than the one initially outlined. He mentioned that to do this broader plan within budget, it would be necessary to pull together public engagement resources and staff from the group. Mr. Field asked the group to provide to him names of anyone else they wanted to include in the public engagement planning aside from the initial list that CBI generated.

Mr. Field also brought up the need to keep the surrounding municipalities – especially Chelsea, Revere, Medford, Malden, and Cambridge – apprised of the group’s activity. It was agreed that Mark Draisen (MAPC) would work with MassDOT to reach out to elected officials in these municipalities to inform them of the group’s progress and the group’s plan to update them during the public engagement phase.